

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-13 and 15-17 are pending in the present application.

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed January 27, 2006. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-13, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant has amended claims 1 and 10. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Under separate cover Applicant is resubmitting Foreign Patent or Published Foreign Patent Application and Other Documents as mentioned in the IDS filed on 02/08/2001 to be considered .

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 10-13 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whiting, et al., (US Patent No. 5,016,009) in view of Dargel, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 4,398,176). The Examiner rejected claims 15-17 under U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Whiting, in view of Dargel, and in further view of Horvath, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 4,450,599). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the following reasons.

Neither Whiting, Dargel, nor Horvath, taken alone or in combination suggest or render obvious a parser, which uses the tokens to prepare the stages for processing.

Whiting does not specifically disclose a plurality of stages, including an initial and an intermediate stage.

The Examiner asserts that Dargel discloses a plurality of stages, including an initial and an intermediate stage. Even, if Dargel discloses a plurality of stages, including an initial and an intermediate stage, Dargel does not disclose a parser used in connection with any of the stages. Instead, Dargel uses “coded command signals of either a local or global type” (See, Dargel, Abstract). It is not clear from Dargel how the coded command signals are generated, other than that they exist at a data source 20 (See, Dargel, Figure 1). As such, either the signals are not parsed or if they are parsed, such an operation occurs outside of the scope of the invention in Dargel and is not associated with the stages as claimed by the present invention.

Horvath includes a controller (LSM), see LSM 18 of Figure 1, for instance. The LSM, for instance “reads the input FIFO to retrieve the block header.” (Horvath, Co. 4, lines 26-28). After receiving a ready signal, the LSM then reads the next header. (Column 5, lines 15-20). See also column 5, lines 64-68 where “control logic” is used describe the operations of the controller (LSM). Thus the LSM is a controller that at best uses “control logic” or already compiled/parsed instructions to operate.

In contrast the present invention uses a parser in the stages configured to use the tokens to prepare the stages for processing. As such, the present claims are not anticipated by either Whiting, Dargel, or Horvath, taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully solicited. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any required fees associated with this Communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 04-1175.

Respectfully submitted,

DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES

Dated: 7/26/06



Micah P. Goldsmith, Esq.
Reg. No. 43,638

DISCOVISION ASSOCIATES
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT
P. O. BOX 19616
IRVINE, CA 92623
(949) 660-5000